DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the arguments filed February 11, 2008. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-29 represent a distributed meeting management system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 24-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Masters et al. US Patent No. 7,051,098. Masters teaches the invention as claimed including a system for monitoring and reporting performance of hosts and applications (see abstract).

As per claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25 and 26 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of distributed collaborative computing comprising:

partitioning a collaboration function into sub-functions (a plurality of host computers are connected to one another and instantiate applications 1-M; column 7, lines 19-67; column 5, lines 33-55)

assigning at least one said sub-function to each of a plurality of logical processes (column 5, lines 55-57)

associating a respective management process with each of said logical processes, said logical processes configured so that each said logical process is capable of communicating with every other said logical process through said respective management process (each application has an instrument daemon and Host Monitor HMA; column 5, lines 56-60);

communicating between said logical processes using said respective management processes (column 5, lines 56-60; the HMA and the applications communicate between each other);

Monitoring said respective management processes with a single supervisor process to determine whether a quality of service is met; and (the Resource Management Architecture collects data from all the instrument daemons; column 5, lines 61-67; column 6, lines 1-40); and

when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process comprises a new collaboration server or a new application server. (program controller send startup orders to the program control agents based on operator or resource manager initiated orders; column 4, lines 8-16; column 6, lines 40-65; column 22, lines 1-27).

As per claims 6, 12, 18 and 24 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 wherein said logical processes are instantiated on at least one physical server (column 5, lines 40-50).

As per claim 27, Masters teaches a method of claim 1, wherein the quality of service represents an ability to respond to data requests from clients (column 7, lines 33-45; column 8, lines 9-60).

As per claim 28, Masters teach the method of claim 1, further comprising:

Spawning a new management process (column 25, lines 55-67);

associating the new management process with the new collaboration server or new application server, wherein the new management process is configured so that the new collaboration server or new application server is capable of communicating with every other said logical process (column 26, lines 1-43).

As per claim 29, Masters teach the method of Claim 1, wherein the new collaboration server or new application server receives configurations, operating parameters and current meeting data from the supervisor process (column 10, lines 40-67; column 11, lines 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 8-11, 14-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masters et al. US Patent No. 7,051,098 in view of Butler US Patent No.

6,584,493. Masters teaches the invention as claimed including a system for monitoring and reporting performance of hosts and applications (see abstract). Butler discloses the invention as claimed including a conferencing and collaboration system (see abstract).

As per claims 2, 8, 14 and 20 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Masters does not teach wherein said collaboration function comprises real time conferencing. Butler teaches wherein said collaboration function comprises real time conferencing (column 9, lines 36-52). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the applications of Masters with the functions of Butler. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to enhance the functionality of the applications.

As per claims 3, 9, 15 and 21 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Masters does not teach wherein said collaboration function comprises application sharing. Butler teaches wherein said collaboration function comprises application sharing (column 9, lines 52-65). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to enhance the functionality of the applications.

As per claims 4, 10, 16 and 22 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Masters does not teach wherein said collaboration function comprises document sharing. Butler teaches wherein said

collaboration function comprises document sharing (column 9, lines 52-65). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to enhance the functionality of the applications.

As per claims 5, 11, 17 and 23 Masters teaches a method, computer program, computer readable medium and computer data signal of claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 wherein each said sub-function forms at least one logical server. Masters does not teach wherein said sub-function comprise collaboration serving, application serving, log serving, license management. Butler teaches wherein each said sub-function forms at least one logical server. Masters does not teach wherein said sub-function comprise collaboration serving, application serving, log serving, license management (column 11, lines 29-44). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to enhance the functionality of the applications.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed February 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. The Office notes the following argument:

a. Masters does not disclose or teach associating a management process with each of the plurality logical processes, in which each logical process is capable of communicating with every other said logical process through the respective management process and the management processes are monitored by a single supervisor processor to determine whether a quality of service is met. whether a quality of service is met. The management

processes associated with the logical processes are not taught by the instrumentations daemons (IDA-IDN) of Masters. Each instrumentation daemon, which resides on a host A-N, reads instrumentation data from the applications on the respective host and sends the data to an instrument collector 10 in the Resource Management Architecture RM. See, e.g., col. 5, lines 62-67. However, nowhere does Masters disclose an application communicating with other applications through the respective instrumentation daemon. The management processes associated with the logical processes are also not taught by the Host Monitors HMAs of Masters.

5. In response to Applicant's argument (a), Masters teaches that the Resource Management Architecture (RMA) is divided into major functional groups, one of which is the instrumentations daemons. There are many other functional groups associated with the RMA, all of which are management processes. See column 7, lines 19-67 and column 8. One process is FG4, the Resource Allocation Decision Making, and another is FG5, Application Resource Control. Both of these groups allow applications to communicate through these processes. Hence, Masters teaches that the logical processes communicate through the management processes.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to UZMA ALAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3995. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Tuesdays 5:30 - 2.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Uzma Alam
Ua
June 5, 2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157